

February 2002

U.N. PEACEKEEPING

Estimated U.S. Contributions, Fiscal Years 1996-2001



G A O

Accountability * Integrity * Reliability

Report Documentation Page

Report Date 00FEB2002	Report Type N/A	Dates Covered (from... to) -
Title and Subtitle U.N.PEACEKEEPING: Estimated U.S. Contributions,Fiscal Years 1996-2001	Contract Number	
	Grant Number	
	Program Element Number	
Author(s)	Project Number	
	Task Number	
	Work Unit Number	
Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es) U.S.General Accounting Office P.O.Box 37050 Washington,D.C.20013	Performing Organization Report Number GAO-02-294	
Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Name(s) and Address(es)	Sponsor/Monitor's Acronym(s)	
	Sponsor/Monitor's Report Number(s)	
Distribution/Availability Statement Approved for public release, distribution unlimited		
Supplementary Notes		
Abstract The United Nations Security Council authorizes peacekeeping as a means to further international peace and security.From fiscal 1996 through 2001,the Security Council authorized or maintained peacekeeping operations in 28 countries.Fifteen operations were as of January 2002.Although U.N.member countries are directly for the cost of conducting these operations,some countries,including United States,implement programs or activities that provide support to peacekeeping operations.		
Subject Terms		
Report Classification unclassified	Classification of this page unclassified	
Classification of Abstract unclassified	Limitation of Abstract SAR	
Number of Pages 36		

Contents

Letter		1
	Results in Brief	2
	Background	3
	U.S. Direct Contributions to U.N. Peacekeeping Operations	6
	U.S. Indirect Contributions Supported U.N. Peacekeeping	7
	Agency Comments and Our Evaluation	9
Appendix I	Objectives, Scope, and Methodology	12
Appendix II	Other U.S. Contributions During Peacekeeping Operations	17
Appendix III	U.S. Indirect Contributions	19
Appendix IV	U.S. Contributions to U.N. Peacekeeping Operations	21
Appendix V	Comments from the Department of State	27
Appendix VI	Comments from the Department of Defense	30
Appendix VII	Comments from the U.S. Agency for International Development	31
Tables		
	Table 1: U.S. Direct and Indirect Contributions to U.N. Operations by Agency, Fiscal Years 1996-2001 (Constant fiscal year 2001 dollars in thousands)	21

Table 2: U.S. Direct and Indirect Contributions to U.N. Peacekeeping Operations by Mission, Fiscal Years 1996-2001	22
--	----

Figures

Figure 1: Locations of 33 U.N. Peacekeeping Operations, Fiscal Years 1996-2001	4
Figure 2: Total U.N. Peacekeeping Costs, Peacekeeping Fiscal Years 1995-2002 (Constant 2001 dollars in billions)	6
Figure 3: U.S. Military Operations Providing Indirect Contributions to U.N. Peacekeeping Operations, Fiscal Years 1996-2001	20

Abbreviations

DOD	Department of Defense
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
U.N.	United Nations
USAID	United States Agency for International Development



United States General Accounting Office
Washington, DC 20548

February 11, 2002

The Honorable Henry J. Hyde
Chairman, Committee on International Relations
House of Representatives

The Honorable Roscoe G. Bartlett
House of Representatives

The United Nations Security Council authorizes peacekeeping operations as a means to further international peace and security. From fiscal years 1996 through 2001, the Security Council authorized or maintained 33 peacekeeping operations in 28 countries. Fifteen operations were ongoing as of January 2002. Although U.N. member countries are directly assessed for the cost of conducting these operations, some countries, including the United States, implement programs or activities that provide indirect support to peacekeeping operations.

This report responds to your request that we determine both the U.S. direct and indirect contributions related to U.N. peacekeeping from fiscal years 1996 through 2001. For this report, contributions include U.S. government expenditures or obligations if data on expenditures are unavailable.¹ (App. I details our scope and methodology.) We also provide information on activities that we do not include as direct or indirect contributions but that the United States has undertaken to assist countries in which the United Nations is conducting peacekeeping operations (see app. II for details on these activities).

To answer your request, we collected and analyzed cost information on U.S. assistance programs and military operations provided by the State Department, the Department of Defense (DOD), the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and the Departments of

¹The cost information in this report is based on official U.S. budget documents, but may not accurately portray precise costs. For example, our audit of the U.S. government's consolidated financial statements for fiscal year 2000 highlighted continuing problems in accurately reporting the costs associated with major portions of the government's operations and possible misstatements concerning reported obligations and outlays. See *U.S. Government Financial Statements: FY 2000 Reporting Underscores the Need to Accelerate Federal Financial Management Reform* (GAO-01-570T, March 30, 2001).

Agriculture, Commerce, Justice, and Treasury. We used State and DOD definitions and reports to estimate the cost of U.S. direct contributions.

We determined which U.S. program costs to include as indirect contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations by comparing the U.S. program objectives, locations, and time frames with the mandates of each U.N. peacekeeping operation. We used this information to determine whether the U.S. activity provided indirect support to the U.N. operation. We also collected information from and discussed our analytical approach with relevant U.S. and U.N. officials, since the U.S. government does not systematically collect data on indirect contributions.

Results in Brief

The United States directly contributed an estimated \$3.45 billion to support U.N. peacekeeping, from fiscal years 1996 through 2001.² Direct contributions are U.S. programs and actions that directly support specific U.N. peacekeeping operations, including (1) about \$3.2 billion the Department of State expended for U.N. current and past due peacekeeping assessments and (2) nearly \$250 million that State and DOD voluntarily spent to support U.S. civilian police, military units, and military observers to serve as an official part of a U.N. peacekeeping operation. As of September 30, 2001, the United States was providing 733 civilian police, soldiers, and military observers to U.N. peacekeeping operations.

We estimate that U.S. indirect contributions that benefited U.N. peacekeeping were about \$24.2 billion, from fiscal years 1996 through 2001. Although there is no common definition within the U.S. government on what constitutes indirect contributions, we defined indirect contributions as U.S. programs and activities that (1) are located in the same area as an ongoing U.N. peacekeeping operation, (2) have objectives that help the peacekeeping operation achieve its mandated objectives, and (3) are not an official part of the U.N. operation. The largest indirect contribution (about \$21.8 billion) stemmed from U.S. military operations and services that helped provide a secure environment for U.N. operations.³ However, the type and extent of indirect contribution varied, depending on whether the U.N. operation was traditional (limited objectives), multidimensional (several objectives), or involved nation-

²Except where noted, all cost estimates in this report are presented in constant fiscal year 2001 dollars.

³Figures for indirect military contributions are cumulative through June 30, 2001.


building (broad and extensive objectives). For example, two U.N. operations in Kosovo and East Timor involved nation-building, and they had extensive objectives, such as creating government agencies and rebuilding the economy. Estimated U.S. indirect contributions to these operations amounted to over \$5 billion and included military operations to help provide a secure environment and programs to provide food and shelter for refugees and train police and court officials.

This report contains no recommendations. We received written comments from State, DOD, and USAID. State and DOD disagreed with our inclusion of indirect contributions, commenting that U.S. operations are undertaken in the U.S. interest and there should not be an implied connection between U.S. operations and U.N. peacekeeping efforts. State also said our draft report implied that the United Nations should reimburse the United States for indirect contributions. We have revised this report to clarify any impression that the United Nations should reimburse the United States for its indirect contributions. However, we disagree with State's and DOD's position that indirect contributions should be excluded from our analysis. Excluding these contributions presents an incomplete picture of the important contribution that the United States has made over the years that help U.N. peacekeeping efforts achieve their objectives. In contrast to State and DOD, USAID said it appreciated our efforts to quantify the value of U.S. contributions to U.N. peacekeeping, adding that its own activities helped make U.N. peacekeeping efforts more effective.

Background

U.N. peacekeeping operations are actions taken as a result of mandates established by U.N. Security Council resolutions designed to further international peace and security. The mandated objectives of these operations range from observing and monitoring the border area of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to providing security and establishing an effective government and economy in East Timor. Personnel assigned to these operations work directly under the control of the United Nations and include soldiers, military observers, civilian police, and U.N. civilian staff. Between fiscal years 1996 and 2001, the United Nations conducted 33 peacekeeping operations in 28 countries (see fig. 1 for the locations of these operations). As of January 2002, 15 of these peacekeeping operations were still ongoing in Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and Asia. These operations deploy over 47,000 military personnel, civilian police, and observers.

Figure 1: Locations of 33 U.N. Peacekeeping Operations, Fiscal Years 1996-2001



Note: Numbers in brackets denote multiple missions.

Source: GAO analysis of U.N. data.

The United Nations assesses member states a percentage share of the total cost of peacekeeping operations. The U.S. assessed share has historically been over 30 percent of total peacekeeping costs, but in November 1994 the Congress limited the amount the United States could pay to 25 percent, starting in fiscal year 1996.⁴ The United Nations continued to bill the United States at the higher assessment rate, leading to U.S. arrears. But in 2000, U.N. member states agreed to change the assessment formula and

⁴P.L. 103-236, § 404(b)(2), 106 Stat. 447.

drop the U.S. share of the peacekeeping budget over a 3-year period to 27 percent.


The annual assessed cost of U.N. peacekeeping operations declined from more than \$3 billion in 1995 to less than \$1 billion in 1999, as the United Nations reduced the number, size, and cost of its operations. During this period, the United Nations ended or reduced its operations in Bosnia, the Central African Republic, Croatia, Haiti, Liberia, Rwanda, and Tajikistan. The Security Council was reluctant to assume new operations or expand existing ones because of member state concerns about the failure of U.N. operations in Somalia, Bosnia, and Rwanda.⁵

Since 1999, however, the United Nations has begun or expanded peacekeeping operations in Kosovo, East Timor, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lebanon, Sierra Leone, and Ethiopia-Eritrea. Because some of these new or expanded operations had objectives to restore peace and security and build effective police forces and justice systems in the countries, they needed the broad international approval that the United Nations could provide. As a result, reported peacekeeping costs for the U.N. peacekeeping budget year ending June 30, 2001, increased to about \$2.6 billion.⁶ Further, State Department and U.N. officials project that expenditures associated with peacekeeping operations for the U.N. peacekeeping budget year ending June 30, 2002, will be more than \$3 billion. Figure 2 depicts the expenditures associated with U.N. peacekeeping operations from 1995 through 2002. The cumulative cost of peacekeeping for these operations during this period was about \$16.3 billion (constant 2001 dollars).

⁵We noted these problems in several previous reports, including *U.N. Peacekeeping: Lessons Learned in Managing Recent Missions* (GAO/NSIAD-94-9, Dec. 29, 1993); *Withdrawal of U.S. Troops from Somalia* (GAO/NSIAD-94-152BR, June 9, 1994); *Peace Operations: Update on the Situation in Former Yugoslavia* (GAO/NSIAD-95-148, Sept. 8, 1995); and *United Nations: Limitations in Leading Missions Requiring Force to Restore Peace* (GAO/NSIAD-97-34, Mar. 27, 1997).

⁶The United Nations prepares peacekeeping budgets based on a year that begins on July 1 and ends on June 30 of the following year.

Figure 2: Total U.N. Peacekeeping Costs, Peacekeeping Fiscal Years 1995-2002 (Constant 2001 dollars in billions)



Note: These dollars are presented in constant 2001 dollars. Each bar provides costs for the U.N. peacekeeping budget year—July 1 to June 30 of the following year.

Source: GAO analysis based on State and U.N. data.

U.S. Direct Contributions to U.N. Peacekeeping Operations

The Departments of State and Defense provided the United Nations about \$3.45 billion in direct contributions to conduct peacekeeping operations between U.S. fiscal years 1996 and 2001. This amount includes contributions for (1) over \$3.2 billion current and past due U.N. peacekeeping assessments and (2) the estimated cost for U.S. civilian police, troops, and military observers to serve directly with U.N. peacekeeping operations minus any U.N. reimbursement to the United States for the costs associated with these personnel.

From fiscal years 1996 through 2001, the United States paid U.N. peacekeeping assessments of about \$2.35 billion. The assessments supported 33 peacekeeping operations conducted during this period. In addition to these payments, the United States paid the United Nations almost \$850 million for past due peacekeeping assessments. Congress

passed legislation in 1999⁷ that appropriated funds for much of the past due payments, under the condition that the United Nations adopt certain reform measures, including a reduction of the U.S. peacekeeping assessment rate. As discussed earlier, the United Nations reduced the U.S. assessment rate for peacekeeping to about 27 percent; and in 2001, Congress passed legislation allowing payment of arrears as a result of this reduction in the rate.⁸

The direct contributions also reflect nearly \$250 million in U.S. voluntary contributions to provide and support U.S. civilian police and military personnel or civilians to serve under the authority of a U.N. peacekeeping force, such as the police officers deployed to Bosnia and Kosovo and the military personnel assigned to U.N. operations in Haiti and Macedonia. These personnel typically serve as military observers, combat soldiers, or police officers or trainers.⁹

U.S. Indirect Contributions Supported U.N. Peacekeeping

We estimate the cumulative U.S. government indirect contributions that help support U.N. peacekeeping operations, between fiscal years 1996 and 2001, at about \$24.2 billion. We define indirect contributions as U.S. programs and activities that are located in the same area as an ongoing U.N. peacekeeping operation, have objectives that help the peacekeeping operation achieve its mandated objectives, and are not an official part of the U.N. operation. About 90 percent of the indirect contributions, or an estimated \$21.8 billion, stemmed from U.S. military operations and services that helped provide secure environments for the U.N. operations to function. (See app. III for information on indirect contributions by each U.S. agency and a map of the locations of the military operations.) However, the extent and type of indirect contribution depended on whether the U.N. operation was (1) traditional—had limited objectives, generally to monitor or supervise cease-fire and peace agreements; (2) multidimensional—had multiple objectives, such as rebuilding the civilian police force and aiding refugees; or (3) nation-building—had broad objectives and executive authority to construct a country's political, legal,

⁷P. L. 106-113, app. G, 113 Stat. 1501A-475-476. The Congress authorized \$926 million to be applied to past due payments for U.N. peacekeeping and other U.N. activities.

⁸P.L. 107-46, 115 Stat. 259.

⁹Many other contributing nations provide police units to U.N. peacekeeping operations from their national police forces; the United States provides police officers to the United Nations under individual contracts.

and economic institutions and provide governmental functions for an interim period. Each successive category entails more objectives and greater effort for the U.N. peacekeeping operations, and we identified correspondingly greater and more costly U.S. indirect contributions for these operations. (App. IV provides more detailed information on all 33 U.N. peacekeeping operations conducted from fiscal years 1996 through 2001 and U.S. contributions to these operations.)

Fourteen traditional peacekeeping operations were conducted during this period; indirect U.S. contributions to these operations cost an estimated \$6.1 billion. The largest contribution assisted the U.N. Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission, which has mandates to monitor the demilitarized zone between Iraq and Kuwait and to deter Iraqi violations of the Kuwait border. U.S.-led military operations in the Persian Gulf area, including ground patrols and naval operations—which cost DOD an estimated \$5.8 billion from fiscal years 1996 through 2001—deter Iraqi aggression. These activities support the U.N. operation’s objective to prevent violations of the Iraq-Kuwait border. Other U.S. indirect contributions, totaling an estimated \$300 million, helped support several U.N. operations by providing emergency food aid, military education and training, and military equipment.

Seventeen multidimensional U.N. operations were conducted between fiscal years 1996 through 2001; U.S. indirect contributions to these operations were an estimated \$13 billion. The largest U.S. indirect contribution to these U.N. operations was for U.S. military operations in Bosnia. For example, the cost to DOD for providing thousands of U.S. military personnel and other aid to North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)-led or coalition-led operations in Bosnia was an estimated \$11.2 billion, from fiscal years 1996 through 2001. These coalition forces provided the secure environment necessary for the U.N. Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina to help restructure the law enforcement and judicial system of Bosnia. U.S. indirect contributions to support Bosnia peacekeeping also included about \$480 million for police and judicial training and humanitarian aid. Other U.S. food aid and assistance programs indirectly helped six multidimensional U.N. operations carry out mandates to help provide humanitarian assistance. For example, several U.S. agency programs, including Food for Peace, provided Rwanda \$140 million for emergency food rations and other humanitarian aid, which helped the U.N. Assistance Mission for Rwanda aid war victims.

U.S. indirect contributions costing an estimated \$5 billion helped the two nation-building operations—the U.N. Interim Administration Mission in

Kosovo and the U.N. Transitional Administration in East Timor. These operations have broad mandates to create or rebuild the countries' government agencies and financial institutions, and U.S. indirect contributions helped the operations in a variety of ways. The largest U.S. indirect contribution was used for U.S. military operations, costing about \$4.1 billion. In Kosovo, for example, U.S. participation in the NATO-led force provided public security and allowed the U.N. mission in Kosovo to function and maintain civil law and order. U.S. bilateral development and assistance programs, estimated at \$900 million, provided additional indirect support to the U.N. operations.¹⁰ For example, State and USAID programs helped create civil and social services in East Timor and provided economic reconstruction assistance in Kosovo.

Agency Comments and Our Evaluation

State, DOD, and USAID provided written comments on a draft of this report that are reprinted in appendixes V, VI, and VII. State and DOD disagreed with the inclusion of indirect contributions in our analysis, while USAID supported it.

Specifically, State and DOD said it was misleading to characterize U.S. military operations as providing support for U.N. peacekeeping activities because it implied a connection between U.N. operations and U.S. programs that does not exist. According to these agencies, U.S. activities are determined solely on the basis of U.S. interests, regardless of any coincidental benefits that may accrue to U.N. peacekeepers; and these benefits should not be equated with providing support to the United Nations.

State also expressed concern that our inclusion of indirect contributions implied that independent actions by the United States or other member nations, even if they provided benefit to the U.N. operations, might be used by the United States or other member countries as a rationale to offset assessed payments to the United Nations for peacekeeping.

In contrast with State and DOD, USAID agreed with our findings, stating that it was fully supportive of a number of indirect contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations. USAID also cited its work to provide

¹⁰Other U.N. member nations also provide similar types of indirect support to U.N. peacekeeping operations, but these contributions were outside the scope of our work.

humanitarian and other assistance to help ensure the success of U.N. peacekeeping operations.

We disagree with State's and DOD's position that indirect contributions should be excluded from our analysis. Excluding these contributions presents an incomplete picture of the important contribution that the United States has made over the years to ensure that U.N. peacekeeping efforts achieve their objectives.


We agree with State and DOD that U.S. operations are undertaken to promote U.S. interests. DOD argued, however, that our report indirectly included or overstated certain DOD operations as supporting U.N. operations, without providing specific instances. But we believe that all the operations we included clearly helped specific U.N. peacekeeping operations. For example, DOD and State have concurred with several of our previous reports that characterized U.S. and NATO military forces as providing support for U.N. and other international organizations' peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo. In those reports, we noted that the stated objectives of U.S. and NATO military operations include providing a secure environment for U.N. civilian police and other U.N.-led operations.¹¹ Nearly two-thirds, or \$15.5 billion, of the total estimated costs that we identified as indirect contributions are attributable to U.S. military operations in support of the two NATO-led peace operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo.

We agree that our report should not be used for the purpose of offsetting U.N. assessments. We do not think indirect contributions should be construed as a contribution for which the United Nations should reimburse the United States and have revised this report to remove any characterization that indirect contributions are provided directly to U.N. operations.

¹¹ See *Bosnia Peace Operation: Progress Toward Achieving the Dayton Agreement's Goals* (GAO/NSIAD-97-132, May 5, 1997); *Bosnia Peace Operation: Pace of Implementing Dayton Accelerated as International Involvement Increased* (GAO/NSIAD-98-138, June 5, 1998); *Bosnia Peace Operation: Mission, Structure, and Transitions Strategy of NATO's Stabilization Force* (GAO/NSIAD-99-19, October 8, 1998); and *Balkans Security: Current and Projected Factors Affecting Regional Stability* (GAO/NSIAD-00-125BR, April 24, 2001).

As arranged with your offices, unless you publicly announce its contents earlier, we plan no further distribution of this report until 7 days after the date of this report. At that time, we will send copies of this report to interested congressional committees, the Secretaries of State, Defense, Agriculture, Commerce, and Treasury; the Attorney General of the United States; the Administrator for the U.S. Agency for International Development; the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Undersecretary General for Peacekeeping Operations; and other interested parties. We will also make copies available to others upon request.

If you or your staff have any questions concerning this report, please call me at (202) 512-8979. Key contributors to this report were Tet Miyabara, B. Patrick Hickey, Ann Baker, Norman Thorpe, and James M. Strus.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Joseph A. Christoff". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "C" at the end.

Joseph A. Christoff, Director
International Affairs and Trade

Appendix I: Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

We estimated direct contributions to peacekeeping operations by analyzing and compiling cost data from a wide range of U.S. and U.N. records, including the President's required annual reports to the Congress on U.S. assistance to U.N. peacekeeping operations for calendar years 1995 through 2000.¹ We also reviewed cost data from the Departments of Defense (DOD), State, Agriculture, Commerce, Justice, and the Treasury; the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID); and the U.N. Department of Peacekeeping Operations. In general, the information on direct contributions used in this report was based on agency expenditures data included in U.S. budget documents. We discussed the data with officials at each agency. According to State and DOD officials and reports, direct contributions are U.S. programs and actions that provide direct support to specific U.N. peacekeeping operations, including (1) current and past due payments for U.N. peacekeeping assessments, and (2) the cost to State and DOD for providing and supporting civilian police, U.S. military units, individual troops, and military observers to serve as part of a U.N. peacekeeping operation.

To estimate the cost² of indirect contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations, we analyzed and compiled information from several U.S. agencies about the cost and purpose of their programs in countries with U.N. peacekeeping operations. DOD provided its available data on incremental costs for overseas contingency operations.³ Officials from State, USAID, Justice, and Agriculture provided data on their security, development, and assistance programs in countries hosting U.N. peacekeeping operations.⁴ Officials from Commerce and Treasury provided data on their technical assistance programs in the same

¹Section 407 of the Foreign Relations Act of 1994 to 1995 requires the President to provide the Congress with annual reports on how the United States used peacekeeping to advance U.S. interests. The reports also list the costs of DOD and State support to each U.N. peacekeeping operation, most of which are for services and materials provided on a reimbursable basis (P.L. 103-236).

²Although we use the term "cost" throughout this report as a convenience, we are actually referring to a combination of actual expenditures and obligations.

³As used in this report, DOD's "incremental costs" means those directly attributable costs that would not have been incurred if it were not for the operation. It should be recognized that DOD's financial systems cannot reliably determine costs and that only the total obligations are captured by the department's accounting systems. The military services use various management information systems to identify incremental obligations and to estimate costs.

⁴All Department of Justice programs included as indirect contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations were funded by the Department of State and USAID.

countries. Officials from all of these agencies provided actual expenditures for programs where they had data and obligations of funds for programs where they did not have actual expenditures data. We limited the scope of this review to fiscal years 1996 through 2001, after determining that useful program data prior to this period was not generally available. Most of the cost data for fiscal year 2001 were based on agency officials' estimates or obligations. We did not independently determine the reliability of available data on costs associated with U.N. peacekeeping operations.

For purposes of our analysis, we defined indirect contributions as U.S. programs and activities that are located in the same area as an ongoing U.N. peacekeeping operation and have objectives that help the peacekeeping operation achieve its mandated objectives, but which are not an official part of the U.N. operation. We used this definition because the U.S. government does not systematically define indirect contributions to peacekeeping and does not collect cost and other data on these indirect contributions, according to State and DOD officials. To determine the estimated cost of U.S. programs and activities included in our definition of indirect contributions, we (1) analyzed the mandates of each of the 33 peacekeeping operations, (2) identified colocated U.S. programs and activities with objectives that corresponded to the objectives of each mandate, and (3) estimated the costs associated with those programs during the periods each U.N. peacekeeping operation was present. If the United Nations terminated a peacekeeping operation prior to the end of a given fiscal year, we included only the costs associated with U.S. programs expended up to that point, if detailed U.S. program expenditure data allowed us to make that determination. If detailed data were not available, we generally included the full estimated fiscal year cost for the U.S. programs associated with U.N. peacekeeping operations terminated after 5 months or more into that fiscal year.

We discussed this definition of indirect contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations and our methodology for arriving at these costs with agency officials. Discussions with these officials and our analysis of prior GAO reports suggest that we define indirect contributions more broadly than some DOD officials but less broadly than some State and USAID officials. For example, DOD officials stated that the costs of U.S. operations not led by U.N. commanders are not part of the U.N.'s assessment of peacekeeping costs and should not be considered as contribution to U.N. operations. Therefore, DOD does not consider the costs of its contributions to the coalition-led peacekeeping forces deployed to Bosnia and Kosovo as contributions to the U.N. peacekeeping operations there. DOD officials stated that these forces were not deployed

specifically or exclusively to support the colocated U.N. peacekeeping operations. We have stated in previous reports that these forces did provide the general security necessary for the colocated U.N. peacekeeping operations to carry out their mandates, however, so we included their estimated incremental costs as indirect contributions.⁵

In contrast to DOD officials, some State and USAID officials define indirect contributions more broadly than we did. For example, USAID officials and documents concluded that almost all of its bilateral humanitarian and development assistance in the African countries hosting U.N. peacekeeping operations could be considered indirect support for those operations. In some cases, we excluded those programs from our estimated cost of indirect contributions because the mandates of specific U.N. peacekeeping operations in Africa did not include humanitarian and development objectives. In other cases, we excluded the costs of regional programs and activities State and USAID officials described as indirectly contributing to U.N. peacekeeping operations because they could not isolate a portion of these regional costs to ascribe to a particular country hosting a peacekeeping operation. (App. II provides more detail on some of these other U.S. programs and activities).

As discussed earlier, we analyzed the mandates for the 33 U.N. peacekeeping operations conducted between fiscal years 1996 and 2001. We compared the objectives, locations, and time frames of each U.N. peacekeeping operation to the U.S. military and civilian assistance programs located in the same countries that were not under the direct control of the U.N. peacekeeping operation. In order to systematically determine which U.S. programs and activities to include as indirect contributions to each U.N. peacekeeping operation, we placed each U.N. peacekeeping operation into one of three categories, depending upon the nature and the expansiveness of its mandates: traditional, multidimensional, and nation-building.

We classified 14 of the operations as having traditional and relatively restricted peacekeeping mandates. These operations generally monitor or supervise cease-fire and other peace agreements between formerly warring parties. Their tasks can include monitoring of border demarcation, exchange of prisoners, and demobilization efforts. Because the

⁵See *Bosnia Peace Operation: Progress Toward Achieving the Dayton Agreement's Goals* (GAO/NSIAD-97-132, May 5, 1997); and *Balkans Security: Current and Projected Factors Affecting Regional Stability* (GAO/NSIAD-00-125BR, April 24, 2001).

narrowness of their mandates tend to preclude a role for the operation in humanitarian or other assistance tasks, most traditional peacekeeping operations do not have identifiable indirect costs associated with them.

We classified 17 operations as having multidimensional mandates. These operations tend to go beyond traditional peace monitoring tasks by attempting to restore or create conditions more conducive to a lasting peace. Multidimensional operations include one or more of the following tasks in their mandates:

- Monitor, supervise, train, or reconstruct police forces and otherwise support efforts to restore rule of law;
- Monitor, assist, or institute efforts to improve human rights;
- Support, facilitate, coordinate, or safeguard humanitarian relief operations or deliveries;
- Monitor, support, coordinate, or safeguard assistance provided to help refugees or internally displaced persons return home and reintegrate into the society of the affected country or region; and
- Conduct, support, or coordinate elections and other democracy-building efforts.

For each multidimensional operation, we included the reported costs of relevant U.S. bilateral assistance programs in the indirect cost total for the operation. We determined these on a case-by-case basis, depending upon the scope of the mandate. For example, we included U.S. bilateral elections support programs and democracy-building assistance for countries where the colocated U.N. peacekeeping force included election supervision or support among its objectives. Furthermore, we excluded the reported costs of other types of U.S. bilateral assistance from the indirect cost total where we could not find an associated objective in the mandates of the colocated U.N. peacekeeping operations. For example, the U.N. Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina is concerned primarily with efforts to monitor, supervise, train, or reconstruct police forces and otherwise support efforts to restore rule of law. We therefore excluded the substantial costs associated with U.S. humanitarian, democracy-building, and long-term economic development assistance provided to Bosnia through the Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe and other international organizations between fiscal years 1996 and 2001.

We classified two recent U.N. peacekeeping operations in Kosovo and in East Timor as having nation-building mandates. In addition to some of the multidimensional tasks previously listed, the U.N. Security Council granted these operations the tasks and the executive authority relating to

the construction or reconstruction of political, legal, and economic institutions. They are also responsible for the interim administration of these countries while helping them develop the capacity for self-government. In these cases, we included the costs of all U.S. bilateral security and assistance programs, development aid, and concurrent DOD operations conducted within Kosovo and East Timor during the time span of the two operations. We excluded only regional assistance programs with costs that could not be attributable specifically to those two states.

We conducted our review from July through December 2001 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

Appendix II: Other U.S. Contributions During Peacekeeping Operations

The United States has also conducted other security and assistance programs and activities that reinforce the objectives of particular U.N. peacekeeping operations but whose objectives cannot be related to the mandates of the peacekeeping operation. For this reason, we have excluded these programs and activities from our tabulation of the costs associated with indirect support for U.N. peacekeeping operations.

These other contributions include the following categories:

- U.S. bilateral humanitarian and development assistance to countries hosting U.N. peacekeeping operations that do not have mandates to conduct humanitarian or development activities. For example, the United Nations has kept a small monitoring operation in Israel, Jordan, Egypt, Lebanon, and Syria since 1948. Given the narrow focus of its mandate, we excluded as indirect contributions, the billions of dollars in assistance programs the United States provides to some of these countries each year.
- U.S. regional assistance activities and operations whose costs cannot be linked to a particular country hosting a peacekeeping operation because these costs are reported only on a regional basis. For example, the State Department provided millions of dollars in humanitarian assistance through its African Great Lakes initiative in fiscal years 1996 and 1997 to aid refugees and displaced persons from Burundi, Rwanda, and the Congo housed in camps in Tanzania and the Congo. State officials could not ascertain how much assistance went specifically to support Rwanda refugees when the U.N. peacekeeping operation was operating in Rwanda, so we did not apportion part of this program as an indirect contribution to the U.N. peacekeeping operation in Rwanda.
- U.S. security assistance to train and equip other nations' military forces, allowing them to participate more effectively in peacekeeping operations in general. For example, State and DOD have provided significant amounts of assistance through their contributions to NATO's Partnership for Peace Program. This assistance trains military units in Ukraine, Central Asia, and the Baltic States to participate in NATO-led or U.N.-led peacekeeping operations, but this assistance could not be ascribed as contributions to specific U.N. peacekeeping operations. Moreover, DOD and State have provided peacekeeping training through the African Crisis Response Initiative and the African Regional Peacekeeping Program to at least 14 African states and two regional organizations. State officials could not break out the portions of these programs that specifically assisted troops assigned to ongoing U.N. peacekeeping operations. We therefore did not attribute a portion of these costs as indirect support for particular U.N. peacekeeping operations.

- U.S. military operations not addressed by a U.N. Security Council resolution, or conducted in support of other U.N. peace activities in which no U.N. peacekeeping operations are present. This category includes a variety of U.S. military contingency operations with costs that are excluded from our definition of indirect contributions. For example, the United States and NATO conducted intensive air strikes against Serbia to bring about a peace agreement in Kosovo in 1999, but they did so without a supporting resolution from the U.N. Security Council. In addition, the United States conducted military strikes against Iraq and maintains a military blockade of Iraq in the Persian Gulf in support of U.N.-sanctioned embargoes and weapons inspection requirements. Furthermore, U.S. military forces in the Republic of Korea simultaneously serve as part of the U.N. Command as well as part of the U.S. Forces Korea and the Republic of Korea-U.S. Combined Forces Command, but these forces are not contributing to an ongoing U.N. peacekeeping operation. Finally, the United States contributes troops to the Multinational Force and Observers, a peacekeeping force deployed in the Sinai peninsula following the signing of the Camp David Accords, after the United Nations failed to reach agreement on deploying a U.N. peacekeeping force.


Appendix III: U.S. Indirect Contributions

Of the \$24.2 billion in indirect U.S. contributions to peacekeeping operations, approximately 90 percent, or \$21.8 billion, came from DOD; about 6 percent (\$1.5 billion) from USAID; about 4 percent (\$810 million) from the Department of State; and less than 1 percent came from the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Treasury for technical assistance programs (\$39 million). Over \$21.6 billion of the DOD contribution was provided for military operations with objectives that helped colocated U.N. peacekeeping operations achieve their mandated objectives.¹ The remainder was provided for humanitarian demining programs and for other equipment and services provided to U.N. peacekeepers or to regional security forces supporting specific U.N. peacekeeping operations. Figure 3 shows the locations of U.S. military operations that provided indirect assistance to U.N. peacekeeping operations.²

¹This figure consists primarily of incremental costs tracked in DOD's contingency operation cost reports. Contingency operations are those that go beyond the routine deployment or stationing of U.S. forces abroad, but that fall short of large-scale theater warfare. DOD figures include the costs of additional pay, training, facilities, transport, fuels, repairs, and replacement parts for an operation.

²DOD reported additional costs associated with Operations Able Sentry and Uphold Democracy as reimbursable direct contributions to U.N. operations in Macedonia and Haiti, respectively.

Figure 3: U.S. Military Operations Providing Indirect Contributions to U.N. Peacekeeping Operations, Fiscal Years 1996-2001



Source: GAO analysis of DOD data.

Appendix IV: U.S. Contributions to U.N. Peacekeeping Operations

The United Nations conducted 33 U.N. peacekeeping operations from fiscal years 1996 through 2001. Table 1 provides total direct and indirect contributions by each agency, and table 2 provides a breakout of the U.N. peace operations by category and provides information about the U.S. direct and indirect contributions to each operation.

Table 1: U.S. Direct and Indirect Contributions to U.N. Operations by Agency, Fiscal Years 1996-2001 (Constant fiscal year 2001 dollars in thousands)

Department or agency	Direct contribution		Total direct	Indirect contributions	Total
	Assessed	Voluntary			
State	\$3,203,169 ^a	\$248,382	\$3,451,551	\$809,417	\$4,260,969 ^c
Defense	0	1,205	1,205	21,786,332	21,787,536 ^c
USAID	0	0	0	1,526,697	1,526,697
Other ^b	0	0	0	39,720	39,720
Total	\$3,203,169	\$249,586^c	\$3,452,755^c	\$24,162,166	\$27,614,921^c

^aIncludes the cost of repaying U.S. arrearages to the United Nations.

^bIncludes contributions from the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Treasury.

^cAdjusted to account for rounding error.

Source: GAO analysis of agency data.

**Appendix IV: U.S. Contributions to U.N.
Peacekeeping Operations**

Table 2: U.S. Direct and Indirect Contributions to U.N. Peacekeeping Operations by Mission, Fiscal Years 1996-2001

			U.S. contributions (Constant fiscal year 2001 dollars in thousands)		
U.N. peacekeeping operation	Duration	Indirect U.S. contributions by U.S. agencies (if any)	Direct	Indirect	Total
Traditional peacekeeping operations					
U.N. Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine (Israel, Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Jordan) (UNTSO)	June 1948 -	DOD: Military observer cost-of-living allowances	\$ 37,990	\$82	\$38,072
U.N. Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP)	Jan. 1949 -	None	10,834	0	10,834
U.N. Disengagement Observer Force (Syrian Golan Heights) (UNDOF)	June 1974 -	None	47,753	0	47,753
U.N. Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP)	Mar. 1964 -	USAID: Bicommunal humanitarian programs	35,034	46,935	81,969
U.N. Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL)	Mar. 1978 -	State: Support for Israel-Lebanon border monitoring group DOD: Demining training	213,379	8,961	222,340
U.N. Mission of Observers in Prevlaka (Croatia) ^a (UNMOP)	Jan. 1996 -	None	^b	0	0
U.N. Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM)	Apr. 1991-	DOD: Military exercises and operations to deter Iraqi aggression	25,891	5,807,153	5,833,044
U.N. Observer Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG)	Aug. 1993 -	USAID: Food aid State: Military education and training DOD: Demining training	31,028	91,085	122,113
U.N. Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE)	July 2000 -	USAID: Border development program State: Military education and training, demining	71,300	3,705	75,005
U.N. Confidence Restoration Operation (Croatia) (UNCRO)	Mar. 1995-Jan. 1996	None	^c	^c	0
U.N. Preventive Deployment Force (Macedonia) (UNPREDEP)	Mar. 1995-Feb. 1999	DOD: Support for U.S. forces serving with U.N. peacekeeping operation	41,002	91,055	132,057
U.N. Verification Mission in Guatemala (MINUGUA) ^d	Jan.-May 1997	None	1,073	0	1,073
U.N. Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (UNOMSIL)	July 1998-Oct. 1999	DOD and State: Equipment and services for African peacekeeping forces	4,258	21,457	25,715

**Appendix IV: U.S. Contributions to U.N.
Peacekeeping Operations**

			U.S. contributions (Constant fiscal year 2001 dollars in thousands)		
U.N. peacekeeping operation	Duration	Indirect U.S. contributions by U.S. agencies (if any)	Direct	Indirect	Total
U.N. Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT)	Dec. 1994-May 2000	State: Refugee assistance USAID: Food aid for refugees	14,828	33,433	48,261
Subtotal for traditional operations			\$534,370	\$6,103,866	\$6,638,236
Multidimensional peacekeeping operations					
U.N. Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara ^a (Morocco) (MINURSO)	Apr. 1991 -	None	25,429	0	25,429
U.N. Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH)	Dec. 1995 -	DOD: Troops for NATO-led coalition enforcing military provisions of the peace agreement State: Police and judicial training, demining Justice: Police and judicial training	323,516	11,680,585	12,004,101
U.N. Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL)	Oct. 1999 -	DOD and State: Support and training for African peacekeeping forces USAID: Food aid	278,698	221,692	500,390
U.N. Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC)	Dec. 1999 -	USAID: Emergency assistance and food aid Agriculture: Food donations	117,262	129,071	246,333
U.N. Protection Force (Bosnia, Croatia, Macedonia) (UNPROFOR)	Feb. 1992-Jan. 1996	DOD: Aircraft maintain no-fly zone over Bosnia	78,932		78,932
U.N. Transitional Administration for E. Slavonia, Baranja, and W. Sirmium (Croatia) (UNTAES)	Jan. 1996-Jan. 1998	State: Refugee assistance and police training	66,706	15,983	82,689
U.N. Civilian Police Support Group (Croatia) (UNPSG)	Jan.-Oct. 1998				
U.N. Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL)	Sep. 1993-Sep. 1997	USAID: Food aid and disaster relief DOD and State: Support for African peacekeeping forces	12,259	276,657	288,916
U.N. Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR)	Oct. 1993-Mar. 1997	USAID: Food aid DOD: Support for demining State: Refugee assistance	15,507	140,838	156,345

**Appendix IV: U.S. Contributions to U.N.
Peacekeeping Operations**

		U.S. contributions (Constant fiscal year 2001 dollars in thousands)			
U.N. peacekeeping operation	Duration	Indirect U.S. contributions by U.S. agencies (if any)	Direct	Indirect	Total
U.N. Angola Verification Mission III (UNAVEM III)	Feb. 1995-Jun. 1997	USAID: Food aid, combatant retraining,	184,949	307,068	492,017
U.N. Observer Mission in Angola (MONUA)	June 1997-Feb. 1999	State: Refugee assistance and demining			
U.N. Mission in the Central African Republic (MINURCA)	Apr. 1998-Feb. 2000	State: Military education and training USAID: Food aid	0	968	968
U.N. Mission in Haiti (UNMIH)	Sep. 1993-Feb. 1996	DOD: Support for U.S. forces serving with U.N. peacekeepers	75,488	216,490	291,978
U.N. Support Mission in Haiti (UNSMIH)	July 1996-July 1997	State and DOD: Support for the national police			
U.N. Transition Mission in Haiti (UNTMIH)	Aug.-Nov. 1997				
U.N. Civilian Police Mission in Haiti (MIPONUH)	Dec. 1997-Mar. 2000				
U.N. Mission in East Timor (UNAMET)	June-Oct. 1999	DOD: support for international coalition forces State: Support for civilian police monitors USAID: transition assistance	2,141	19,575	21,716
Subtotal for multidimensional operations			\$1,180,887	\$13,008,927	\$14,189,814

**Appendix IV: U.S. Contributions to U.N.
Peacekeeping Operations**

			U.S. contributions (Constant fiscal year 2001 dollars in thousands)		
U.N. peacekeeping operation	Duration	Indirect U.S. contributions by U.S. agencies (if any)	Direct	Indirect	Total
Nation-Building peacekeeping operations					
U.N. Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK)	June 1999 -	U.S. Agencies DOD: Troops for NATO-led coalition enforcing provisions of cease-fire and withdrawal agreements, public security, and assistance for local civilian protection units State: Refugee and economic assistance Agriculture: Food donations USAID: Refugee and development assistance Justice: Police and judicial training Treasury/Commerce: Technical assistance	446,175	4,833,670	5,279,845
U.N. Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET)	Oct.1999 -	U.S. Agencies DOD: Humanitarian and civic assistance State: Support for U.N. administration and law enforcement USAID: Food aid, refugee assistance, and democracy building Justice: Police and judicial training	316,659	208,586	525,245
Subtotal for nation-building operations			\$762,834	\$5,042,256	\$5,805,090
Total contributions for operations			\$2,478,091	\$24,155,049	\$26,633,140
Assessments appropriated by the Congress for U.N. peacekeeping operations but not sent to the United Nations as of January 31, 2002			126,620	0	126,620
U.N. arrearage payments			847,830	0	847,830
Support for U.N. Rapidly Deployable Mission Headquarters			215	0	215
U.S. Military Observer Group overhead			0	7,105	7,105
Grand total^a			\$3,452,755	\$24,162,166	\$27,614,921

^aThis operation is located in an area of disputed ownership between Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).

^bDirect costs are included in UNMIBH.

**Appendix IV: U.S. Contributions to U.N.
Peacekeeping Operations**

^cDirect and indirect costs for UNCRO are combined with costs for UNTAES.

^dThe U.N. mission was part of a larger non-U.N. regional peace operation with the same acronym.

^eMorocco, Mauritania, and a local independence group dispute the ownership of this territory.

^fIndirect costs are included in UNMIBH.

^gTotals are adjusted to account for rounding errors.

Source: GAO analysis of agency data.

Appendix V: Comments from the Department of State



United States Department of State

Washington, D.C. 20520

FEB - 1 2002

Dear Ms. Westin:

We appreciate the opportunity to review your draft report, "U.N. PEACEKEEPING: Estimated U.S. Contributions, Fiscal Years 1996 - 2001," GAO-02-294, GAO Job Code 320067.

The Department's comments are enclosed for incorporation, along with this letter, as an appendix to the GAO final report.

If you have any questions regarding this response, please contact Charles Casper, Office of Peacekeeping and Humanitarian Operations, Bureau of International Organization Affairs on (202) 736-7789.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Christopher B. Burnham".

Christopher B. Burnham
Assistant Secretary and
Chief Financial Officer

Enclosure:

As stated.

cc: GAO/IAT - Mr. Christoff
State/OIG - Mr. Berman
State/IO - Mr. Imbrie

Ms. Susan S. Westin,
Managing Director,
International Affairs and Trade,
U.S. General Accounting Office.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE COMMENTS ON GAO DRAFT REPORT

**U.N. PEACEKEEPING: Estimated U.S. Contributions,
Fiscal Years 1996-2001"**

(GAO-023-294, Job Code 320067)

The Department of State appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft report. We have reviewed the report and have no comment on the calculations made. Our primary concern is with the GAO definition of "indirect contributions" to UN peacekeeping operations and the resultant use of the definition.

On page 2, the GAO states "Although there is no common definition within the U.S. government as to what constitutes indirect contributions, we have defined indirect contributions as U.S. programs and activities that are located in the same area as an ongoing U.N. peacekeeping operation, have objectives that help the peacekeeping operation achieve its mandated objectives, and are not an official part of the U.N. operation." Using this definition, the GAO found \$21.8 billion (90 percent) in U.S. military operations and services of the \$24.2 billion total estimated "U.S. indirect contributions." Most of these U.S. military activities were for activities related to Iraq, Kosovo and Bosnia.

Our concern is that the GAO definition results in misleadingly high figures for contributions by the U.S. military to UN peacekeeping operations. The term "indirect contributions" implies a connection between the UN operations and the U.S. programs and activities that does not exist. U.S. programs and activities are determined independently, solely on the basis of U.S. interests and policies. Just as we would resist being billed for autonomous and independent actions by other states, even if they provided some benefit to UN operations, so the UN and its members states would resist attempts to offset our assessed payments with such U.S. programs and activities. Moreover, if other states claimed their independent military operations constituted "indirect contributions" to

UN peacekeeping operations, the U.S. would oppose any financial claims on the U.S. as lacking U.S. authorization.

Therefore, using a criterion of being located in the same area and sharing the same objectives results in a distorted measure of U.S. contributions to UN operations. U.S. military activities around the world constitute direct and purposeful contributions to our own U.S. security interests irrespective of any coincidental benefits that may accrue to regional peacekeeping efforts.

Appendix VI: Comments from the Department of Defense



SPECIAL OPERATIONS/
LOW-INTENSITY CONFLICT

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-2500

FEB 6 2002

Mr. Joseph A. Christoff
Director, International Affairs and Trade
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

Dear Mr. Christoff:

This is the Department of Defense (DoD) response to the General Accounting Office (GAO) draft report, "U.N. Peacekeeping: Estimated U.S. Contributions, Fiscal Years 1996-2001," dated January 18, 2002 (Code 320067). We appreciate the opportunity to review the draft report.


DoD disagrees with the GAO's portrayal of various DoD operations as constituting "indirect support" or "indirect contributions" to United Nations peacekeeping. DoD also disagrees with the GAO's inclusion of the total costs of these DoD operations in attempting to tally a total dollar value for "contributions" to United Nations peacekeeping.

The GAO report incorrectly states that certain DoD operations supported United Nations operations. In other cases, the report overstates the extent to which other DoD operations supported United Nations operations. While U.S. forces' activities may have advanced U.S. objectives similar to those of nearby, separate United Nations operations, as well as those of many other parties, that does not equate to providing the United Nations with "support."

We have provided the GAO with separate, detailed comments to address these concerns as well as other errors of fact and technical matters in the draft report.

Should you have any questions or require further information regarding this report, please contact Jim Alverson of my office at 703-614-0446.

Sincerely,


Joseph J. Collins
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Stability Operations

Appendix VII: Comments from the U.S. Agency for International Development



U.S. AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT

FEB 4 2002

Mr. Joseph A. Christoff
Director
International Affairs and Trade
U.S. General Accounting Office
441 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20548

Dear Mr. Christoff:

I am pleased to provide the U.S. Agency for International Development's (USAID) formal response on the draft GAO report entitled "U.N. PEACEKEEPING: Estimated U.S. Contributions, Fiscal Years 1996-2001" [February 2002]. Although USAID does not provide U.S. Government (USG) direct contributions to U.N. Peacekeeping Operations, the Agency has been fully supportive of indirect contributions to a number of the 17 multi-dimensional U.N. Peacekeeping Operations conducted between fiscal years 1996 and 2001. USAID, through its Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance, Office of Food for Peace, Office of Transition Initiatives, and Regional Bureaus, has worked to provide indirect support to U.N. Peacekeeping Operations during the period examined.


USAID is appreciative of the GAO's efforts to quantify the value of USG contributions to international peacekeeping efforts headed by the U.N. to maintain security and create the conditions necessary for peace. USAID's role cannot be underestimated in determining the overall effectiveness of a multi-dimensional U.N. Peacekeeping Operation. By providing emergency non-food and food commodities as well as rehabilitation and development assistance to affected populations during periods of conflict, USAID is attempting to develop stability and ensure the success of U.N. Peacekeeping Operations.

1300 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20523

-2-

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the GAO draft report and for the courtesies extended by your staff in the conduct of this review.

Sincerely,



John Marshall
Assistant Administrator
Bureau for Management

GAO's Mission

The General Accounting Office, the investigative arm of Congress, exists to support Congress in meeting its constitutional responsibilities and to help improve the performance and accountability of the federal government for the American people. GAO examines the use of public funds; evaluates federal programs and policies; and provides analyses, recommendations, and other assistance to help Congress make informed oversight, policy, and funding decisions. GAO's commitment to good government is reflected in its core values of accountability, integrity, and reliability.

Obtaining Copies of GAO Reports and Testimony

The fastest and easiest way to obtain copies of GAO documents is through the Internet. GAO's Web site (www.gao.gov) contains abstracts and full-text files of current reports and testimony and an expanding archive of older products. The Web site features a search engine to help you locate documents using key words and phrases. You can print these documents in their entirety, including charts and other graphics.

Each day, GAO issues a list of newly released reports, testimony, and correspondence. GAO posts this list, known as "Today's Reports," on its Web site daily. The list contains links to the full-text document files. To have GAO e-mail this list to you every afternoon, go to www.gao.gov and select "Subscribe to daily e-mail alert for newly released products" under the GAO Reports heading.

Order by Mail or Phone

The first copy of each printed report is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. A check or money order should be made out to the Superintendent of Documents. GAO also accepts VISA and Mastercard. Orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent. Orders should be sent to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
P.O. Box 37050
Washington, D.C. 20013

To order by Phone: Voice: (202) 512-6000
 TDD: (202) 512-2537
 Fax: (202) 512-6061

Visit GAO's Document Distribution Center

GAO Building
Room 1100, 700 4th Street, NW (corner of 4th and G Streets, NW)
Washington, D.C. 20013

To Report Fraud, Waste, and Abuse in Federal Programs

Contact:

Web site: www.gao.gov/fraudnet/fraudnet.htm,
E-mail: fraudnet@gao.gov, or
1-800-424-5454 or (202) 512-7470 (automated answering system).

Public Affairs

Jeff Nelligan, Managing Director, NelliganJ@gao.gov (202) 512-4800
U.S. General Accounting Office, 441 G. Street NW, Room 7149,
Washington, D.C. 20548